Agency Strategic Planning Session

Attendees:
Manson Yew
Ron Montague
Lisa Carr
Chris Chantler
Warren Connley
Jeff Little
Kathy Schubert
Harvey Schabes
Rafael Sanabria
Greta Lowe
Tony Miranda
Tony Colletta
Zach Kantzes
Denise Londrigan
Brad Mudgett
Steve Newman
Ed Rogers
Paul Moylan
Mike Dunham

Vision and Mission for knowledge management at NASA:

- Elements:
    - management involvement and support through reminding program managers of the importance of the use of tools to facilitate knowledge management
    - Who's going to own the process for knowledge management
    - Basic premise is to "capture" the information
- Barriers:
    - Disconnect in my involvement, vs IT involvement: ie Who owns the knowledge management systems
    - Segregation of data "expertise protection" NASA values experts competition
    - No developed cohesive guideline for knowledge management
    - Pieces should work together synergistically
    - Time/resources/priorities/budget all dictate how time is spent and where attention is paid- not a requirement. Need to show value to various groups of people
- Two elements- knowledge capture as an individual/ ie management your knowledge as an individual
- Top level management approach
- First do no harm
- Our systems must not violate trust of the integrity of individuals to work together and to get their work done
- Our organizational hierarchy and our processes must build trust

- Our system processes builds trust
- Both sides need to understand the roles to have the trust to share information- our systems must not violate the trust of individuals to work together, but instead build trust
- Provide for knowledge to be disseminated for consumption
- Provide information relative to shat the consumer cares about
- Provide for an integrated approach “pieces will work together”
- Provide opportunities and environments for meaningful exchange and learning
- Enables the different users to benefit from agency knowledge

Why do we need better knowledge management at NASA

- We have “data crypts”/ data segregation

How can we achieve it?

What is the definition of knowledge management?

What processes exist at NASA that could assist us? (ie, IDA’s)

Strengths
What should be the strengths of a knowledge management system at NASA

Strengths, weakness, threats, opportunities
Open discussion on methodologies and implementation approaches

Issue of Trust:
A lot of people are collecting information that they are not intimately connected to the information and not involving people working with the data and the way it’s captured and used is not value added

Involved in collecting data as opposed to working with data
Time is an issue
Management support is not available
Managers may feel an IT function and not utilizing time efficiently
Funded by Chief of OSMA to promote safety and mission success

Need to make managers aware that the people are using the tool to make them aware and show the efficiency
Where should time be charged? No PBMA contract. Tool is to help you work and provide value added service as opposed to being another job to charge a task to.
Many people use site but people don't want to devote time to managing the site
Many people may say "What's in it for me?"
Looking for logistic support
Who's going to own the process of knowledge management for the Agency?
PBMA has enough momentum at this point to move forward as the Agency solution (as opposed to when it came out originally)
NASA's culture rewards expertise and therefore people may not want to share their knowledge
Instead of promoting and sharing your knowledge- promote as a way to prove your expertise

1. Bottoms up: Brings value to those doing the work without management support
2. Top level management km approach: Top-down approach which is still evolving through the enterprise architecture
3. KR letter just went out and is being populated, took a long time to build bridge with CMS and partnerships and use for balancing workforce
4.

Bigger issue than one organization- need to involve more organizations in partnership

1. How do people management their knowledge so it doewsn't get lost
2. NASA ownership of knowledge

These two cannot be confused or we set up for building one system and set up for failure

Conflict between taking forever to get requirements
Vs
Building tool without defining requirements

What is the right amount of them managing their knowledge at a work group level and giving them ownership in that process vs knowledge that needs to be flowed up to NASA as organizational knowledge

Besides building trust, we should build and work towards a defined set of objectives- there's too much competition
Must be a tangible win-win situation
Build the trust around a shared objective

Conversations facilitate knowledge and continue to have events like this to have discussions- work with Center KM person to connect people and knowledge

People, Processes, and Tools create knowledge management

A lot of discussion of creation/sharing of knowledge but not consuming knowledge

Nobody is provided incentives for sharing their knowledge- instead, everything states that you should share knowledge so future people can learn

Must have meaningful interchange and learning where time is worthwhile for people who come and people who share in an environment that was created to be conducive the interchange

Bryan O'Connor was part of sessions in which the top person shared a very personal story of something they've done/learned which opened the door for others to share their stories

Share the critical exceptions as opposed to all of the information that is documented in the guidelines and policies

Usenet was very valuable to both lurkers and contributors- why? Why is this feature so prevalent and valuable throughout the history and how can we use that to promote PBMA

ENABLING people to get work done through PBMA